

Mr. CARDIN: I cannot promise that; but this is a revote.

Mr. DUPUIS: O.K., then.

Mr. MacNICOL: Yes, O.K., if it is a revote and continues to be a revote. But before even a revote is placed in the estimates, I think the minister should wait for the report of the International Joint Commission. He will remember that last year he said in effect: Well, we will have the International Joint Commission make a survey. If the International Joint Commission O.K.'s any proposal to canalize the Richelieu river at twenty-seven feet, I say the International Joint Commission ought to be abolished. But I am convinced that their engineers will never recommend any such proposal.

This whole thing should be left over until we have the report of the engineers, and then the country can fairly determine what policy should be pursued, whether we should canalize the Richelieu, or run the canal from a point six miles east of Montreal, which are the only two proposals that can be considered. As far as the United States are concerned, they have definitely made up their minds so far as I can see, to deepen the Erie canal to fourteen feet if they can find the water to operate it. They now have it deepened to fourteen feet for part of its length, but so far they cannot find water to operate it the whole length at that depth. They have constructed two large reservoirs, but they were prevented from going further because of the uncertainty of finding additional water in New York state with which to operate a fourteen foot canal. If they can get that water they are ready to forget all about the Richelieu or the lake Champlain canal, because that would not be of any convenience to them.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, no!

Mr. MacNICOL: Well, I discussed it with engineers at Albany and all up and down the series of canals, as well as in Washington, and so far as I am concerned I am certain that they are not interested in a twelve foot canal, so any expenditure by this country on a canal of that depth would be of doubtful value.

Mr. CARDIN: I probably should say a word in reply to the hon. member. The large amount of money he has mentioned in connection with the development of the Richelieu river refers to a development at a depth of twenty-seven feet.

Mr. MacNICOL: I said from twenty-seven to thirty feet.

Mr. CARDIN: Yes; it would be equivalent to the proposed development of the great

lakes-St. Lawrence system. The proposal for the development of the Richelieu river to a depth of twelve or fifteen feet may not interest the United States, but it may be of interest to Canada. It may be of interest to that section of Canada through which the Richelieu river flows.

The reference made to the International Joint Commission is not for the purpose of obtaining the approval of that body of the development of the Richelieu river through its canalization. We have referred to the International Joint Commission the proposal with respect to the dam we propose to build with this sum of money between St. Johns and Chambly. That dam may have the effect of raising or lowering the water on lake Champlain, because it is being built between Chambly and St. Johns in order to permit the regulation of the flow of the Richelieu river during the navigation season.

The banks of the Richelieu river from St. Johns to the boundary are low. In fact, about a mile or two above St. Johns, one would think that the Richelieu is not a river but rather a lake.

Mr. MacNICOL: It is partly a lake.

Mr. CARDIN: The river is very wide, because the banks are low. All the land is flooded by high waters in the spring, and those high waters do not disappear soon enough in most years to permit cultivation of the low lands on the Canadian as well as the American territory.

In order to dispose of that large amount of water each spring, it was proposed as far back as 1907 to dredge the river between the town of St. Johns and the boundary. But when parliament voted the money and we began dredging that section of the river, the Americans intervened and said, "By dredging the river between St. Johns and the boundary you are going to increase the section of the river. It is true that the water would flow more rapidly in the spring, but it would also flow more rapidly during the summer, and you are going to lower the level of lake Champlain."

That was their objection. It was as a result of that objection that Canada and the United States discussed the proposal of building a regulating dam between St. Johns and Chambly. That dam would be open during the spring, when the water is high, and the river having been dredged between St. Johns and the boundary, the water would flow rapidly in the spring through the openings of the regulating dam. But when the high water of the spring had passed the regulating dam would be closed and the level of the water on the Richelieu river as well as on lake Champlain